



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,568	10/15/2003	Lasse Wesseltoft Mogensen	8465/40	7139
757	7590	12/13/2005	EXAMINER	
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE			HAN, MARK K	
P.O. BOX 10395			ART UNIT	
CHICAGO, IL 60610			PAPER NUMBER	

3767

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/687,568

Applicant(s)

MOGENSEN ET AL.

Examiner

Mark K. Han

Art Unit

3767

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 32-43 and 50-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 32-43 and 50-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 October 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>see continuation</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

10/687,568

Continuation of Attachment(s): 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: 20 January 2004; 09 February 2004; 13 June 2005; 13 July 2005

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Applicant's election of Group III, Species IV in the reply filed on 15 September 2005 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
2. Claims 32 and 55 appear to link Species I-IV. The restriction requirement among the linked species is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claims 32 and 55. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked species shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant should confirm the generic status of claims 32 and 55.

*Specification*

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 36 suggests that the strips and plunger are molded as a unitary component. This is not described in the specification.

*Drawings*

4. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the strips and plunger molded as a unitary component of claim 36 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet”

Art Unit: 3767

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Double Patenting*

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 32-41 and 50-64 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-43 of U.S. Patent No. 6,830,562 to Mogensen et al. (hereinafter “Mogensen”). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the application claims are merely broader than the patented claims. The patented claims “anticipates” the application claims. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

7. Claims 42, 43 and 65 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-43 of U.S. Patent No. 6,830,562 in view of U.S.

Art Unit: 3767

Patent No. 5,643,214 to Marshall et al. (hereinafter "Marshall"). The claims of the Mogensen patent disclose each element of the application claims as shown above. The Mogensen patent claims, however, do not disclose diametrically opposed manual engagement areas. Marshall discloses an injection device having diametrically opposed manual engagement areas 27. See Figures 6A-C. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Mogensen by placing the manual engagement areas diametrically opposite each other because it would be readily apparent to the artisan of ordinary skill that having engagement areas that are diametrically opposed is functionally equivalent to having one at an axial end of the device.

8. Applicant is advised that should claim 35 be found allowable, claim 52 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 32-41, 50-57 and 61-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,093,172 to Funderburk et al. (hereinafter "Funderburk").

Funderburk discloses an injector device having a housing 28/38, lock 58, drive 36, flexible plastic members 56/94, plunger 54, needle 12, tubing and recess 100. See Figures 1-34.

In reference to claim 40, Funderburk shows a needle 26 having a lateral opening 22.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 42, 43, 58-60 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Funderburk in view of Marshall.

In reference to claims 42, 43 and 65, Funderburk discloses the claimed invention as shown above. Funderburk, however, discloses a manual engagement area at one axial end of the injection device. Marshall discloses an injection device having diametrically opposed manual engagement areas 27. See Figures 6A-C. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Funderburk by placing the manual engagement areas diametrically opposite each other because it would be readily apparent to the artisan of ordinary skill that having engagement areas that are diametrically opposed is functionally equivalent to having one at an axial end of the device.

In reference to claims 58-60, Funderburk discloses the claimed invention as shown above. Funderburk, however, does not disclose a cover for the injection device. Marshall discloses a cover 30 to protect the device from contamination. See Figures 6A-C. It would have



Art Unit: 3767

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Funderburk by including a cover, as suggested by Marshall, in order to maintain the sterility of the device.

*Contact Information*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark K. Han whose telephone number is 571-272-4958. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 9 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Sirmons can be reached on 571-272-4965. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*mkh.*

Mark K. Han  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 3767

mkh  
December 10, 2005

KEVIN C. SIRMONS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

*Kevin C. Sirmons*